



Setti D. Warren  
Mayor

**City of Newton, Massachusetts**  
Department of Planning and Development  
1000 Commonwealth Avenue Newton, Massachusetts 02459

Telephone  
(617) 796-1120  
Telefax  
(617) 796-1142  
TDD/TTY  
(617) 796-1089  
www.newtonma.gov

Candace Havens  
Director

**MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARINGS  
CHESTNUT HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**

**DATE:** June 19, 2014

**PLACE/TIME:** City Hall, Room 202  
7:30 p.m.

**ATTENDING:** John Wyman, Chair  
Joyce Dostale, Member  
Robert Imperato, Member  
William Roesner, Member  
Samuel Perry, Alternate  
Peter Vieira, Alternate  
Barbara Kurze, Commission Staff  
See Attendance List

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. with John Wyman presiding as Chair. Voting permanent members were J. Dostale, R. Imperato and W. Roesner. Alternate members S. Perry and P. Vieira were appointed to vote as full members. B. Kurze acted as recording secretary and the meeting was digitally recorded on an H2 Zoom recording device.

The owner of **18 Nancy Road** requested that the application review be postponed until landscape architect, Carroll Williamson, was present.

**19 Reservoir Avenue – Certificate of Appropriateness**

The owner, Justine Barletta, and Robert Flaherty of Indresano Corporation, presented an application to remove a wall ex post facto and install a landscape wall. R. Flaherty explained that they had contacted the Planning Department and were told no special permits were required. After the failing fieldstone wall was removed, the owner was informed that she needed approval from the Chestnut Hill Historic District Commission and the work was stopped. The new wall would be double-faced fieldstone, 22-inches high and 18-inches wide; with 30-inch high fieldstone piers capped with bluestone on either side of the walkway.

**Materials Reviewed:**

*Photographs*

*Site plan (Mortgage Inspection Plan and legal description)*

*Drawing*

Commission members noted that the removed wall was an extension of the dry stack wall at 7 Reservoir Avenue and that demolition would not have been approved. Commission members stated that the new

wall should be compatible with the wall at 7 Reservoir. W. Roesner requested that the new wall construction match the older historic wall down the hill in its construction type and image. J. Dostale commented that extending the wall to both sides of the walkway was an improvement over the previous configuration, which appeared unbalanced; she stated that the piers with caps at the walkway were appropriate. P. Vieira expressed concern that the proposed wall looked too formal, symmetrical and finished.

S. Perry requested that the applicants build a mock-up section consistent with the dry stack character and materials of the wall at 7 Reservoir. R. Flaherty agreed to build a six-foot mock-up section; he noted that new, washed fieldstone had a different appearance from older fieldstone and that the new section would probably be tighter. J. Wyman stated that after Commission members reviewed the mock-up, the discussion could be continued in the July 17<sup>th</sup> meeting. The applicant approved the extension of the hearing.

### **18 Nancy Road – Certificate of Appropriateness**

The application was first presented at the April 17<sup>th</sup> meeting. The owner, Michael Simon, and the landscape architect, Carroll Williamson presented the revised plans to build a Roxbury puddingstone retaining wall across the front of the property. The existing walkway would be replaced with Sandy Point granite (similar to the veneer material); the stairs would be Roxbury puddingstone with Sandy Point granite treads.

#### **Materials Reviewed:**

*Revised plan*

*Revised elevation*

W. Roesner expressed concern that three different types of stone were proposed and that puddingstone was not an appropriate material. S. Perry commented that puddingstone related to the period before the 1950s properties on Nancy Road were built and was appropriate. J. Wyman proposed that the wall be tapered to fit in better.

J. Wyman motioned to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as submitted with the added requirements that: 1) instead of an 18-inch consistent height, the wall would taper at the appropriate point; and 2) revised drawings would be submitted for staff review. S. Perry seconded the motion. This motion was passed, 5-1.

### **RECORD OF ACTION:**

**DATE:** June 19, 2014

**SUBJECT:** 18 Nancy Road - Certificate of Appropriateness

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on June 19, 2014 the Chestnut Hill Historic District Commission, by vote of 5-1,

RESOLVED to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as submitted at 18 Nancy Road to build a retaining wall across the front of the property and to replace the existing walkway with the added requirements that: 1) instead of an 18-inch consistent height, the wall would taper at the appropriate point; and 2) revised drawings would be submitted for staff review.

#### **Voting in the Affirmative:**

**John Wyman, Chair**  
**Samuel Perry, Alternate**

**Joyce Dostale, Member**  
**Peter Vieira, Alternate**

**Robert Imperato, Member**

#### **Voting in the Negative:**

**142 Suffolk Road – Certificate of Appropriateness**

Dr. Steven Tobolsky, Head of School, and Elton Matos, Facilities Manager, presented an application to replace approximately three existing parking lot lights. Dr. Tobolsky stated that the new lights addressed safety concerns for people working late at the Chestnut Hill School; he noted that there had been accidents and issues with intruders. E. Matos explained that the existing walkway lights did not provide enough radius coverage; the proposed replacements were LED area lights mounted on 15-foot poles. E. Matos also noted that there was an existing 20-foot light pole in the center of the island.

**Materials Reviewed:**

*Photographs*

*Site plan*

*Product specifications*

S. Perry expressed concern that the proposed lights looked institutional; he noted that when the property expansion was approved, there was agreement that the property would not have an institutional character. Commission members noted other options, such as modern gaslights, that were more in character with the historic Chestnut Hill Chapel. Commission members discussed issues with the quality, brightness and direction of different light fixtures; P. Vieira noted that lamps created glare and modern fixtures directed light at the ground. J. Wyman proposed that the applicant hire a lighting designer who could propose a comprehensive solution that met safety needs and minimized the visual impact of the project. J. Wyman noted that this type of lighting project would ordinarily not be approved in a predominantly residential area; this project was justified because of safety concerns, however, the visual impact needed to be minimized. Dr. Tobolsky agreed to explore options for more appropriate fixtures that provided sufficient light. The applicants approved the extension of the hearing to a future regularly scheduled meeting.

**142 Suffolk Road – Certificate of Appropriateness**

The Commission agreed to review an application to repair the stone wall along Hammond Street. Elton Matos, Facilities Manager, and Dr. Steven Tobolsky, Head of School, presented the application. E. Matos explained that they started repointing work on the inside of the wall and joint cutting on the side facing Hammond Street without a certificate; they were told that a certificate was not needed as it was repair in-kind. Dr. Tobolsky stated that the wall was degraded and there were safety issues because of loose and falling stones.

**Materials Reviewed:**

*Photographs*

J. Wyman asked if the mortar being used was identical to the existing; E. Matos stated that the mortar was a softer mortar as recommended by Dr. Judith Selwyn of Preservation Technology Associates, LLC. S. Perry expressed concern that the power chisels used to cut the joints were damaging the existing stone and widening the joints; he questioned whether the mortar and the mortar profile were appropriate. J. Wyman stated that the wall was an important landmark and that the Commission wanted assurances that the repointing methods and materials were appropriate. J. Wyman requested that the applicants obtain a report from a recognized expert with recommendations on the appropriate methods and materials (equipment, joint cutting, mortar mix, and mortar profile); S. Perry noted that Dr. Selwyn was a recognized expert. J. Wyman stated that a Certificate of Non-Applicability would be approved based on repair in-kind and subject to the applicants' compliance with the methods and materials outlined in the report.

**17 Suffolk Road – Certificate of Appropriateness**

The owner, Nancy Younger, presented an application to replace 13 windows with Pella Architect Series Replacement windows. A similar project to replace nine windows was approved at the May 16, 2013 meeting.

Materials Reviewed:

*Photographs*

*Product specifications*

Commission members requested that additional elevation photographs be submitted that clearly identified the windows to be replaced. J. Wyman motioned to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as submitted with the added requirement that photographs of the elevations with the proposed replacement windows identified be submitted. S. Perry seconded the motion. This motion was passed unanimously, 6-0.

**RECORD OF ACTION:**

**DATE:** June 19, 2014

**SUBJECT:** 17 Suffolk Road - Certificate of Appropriateness

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on June 19, 2014 the Chestnut Hill Historic District Commission, by vote of 6-0,

RESOLVED to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as submitted at 17 Suffolk Road to replace 13 windows with the added requirement that photographs of the elevations with the proposed replacement windows identified be submitted.

Voting in the Affirmative:

**John Wyman, Chair**

**William Roesner, Member**

**Joyce Dostale, Member**

**Samuel Perry, Alternate**

**Robert Imperato, Member**

**Peter Vieira, Alternate**

**109 Essex Road – Certificate of Appropriateness**

Lisa Botticelli of Botticelli & Pohl Architects, and John Haven and Douglas Jones of Keith LeBlanc Landscape Architecture, represented the owner of the property and presented an application for a two phase project to renovate the existing landscape, change an existing addition, and add a garage bay. J. Wyman noted that the Commission had jurisdiction to make non-binding recommendations for the project.

Materials Reviewed:

*Assessor's Map*

*Photographs*

*Site plans*

*Elevations*

*Floor plans*

D. Jones explained that the existing drive was awkward and unsafe and would be landscaped over. A new drive screened by plantings, paved parking areas, brick walls and wood vehicular and pedestrian gates would be installed in the back of the house. A small walkway at Gatehouse Road and a third garage bay with a green roof would also be built. D. Jones stated that additional paved areas and low brick retaining walls with brick caps would be built in the front of the house. Vegetation in front would be opened up to feature the central front elevation of the house; the elms in front would be preserved. P. Vieira commented that the existing corner view was picturesque and would be lost with the new landscaping; W. Roesner commented that the house was symmetrical and the new landscaping emphasized that. J. Dostale commented that there would be a large amount of paved areas on the front of the property; L. Botticelli stated this signaled that the entry was there.

D. Jones stated that the lawn in the rear of the property would be leveled and a fence added close to the back of the lot. J. Wyman commented that the character of the district was open landscaping; these changes closed off the area and presented like a fenced-in enclave. J. Dostale noted that solid walls and fences were being added along Gatehouse Road. D. Jones responded that the fence would be hidden in vegetation and would not be obvious, and that the landscaping opened up the house and improved the vista where the current drive was. P. Vieira commented that the design was skillful but changed the character of the setting by organizing and formalizing the landscape.

L. Botticelli explained that the earlier addition would be expanded and would have brick across the bottom and painted white wood boarding. W. Roesner commented that the drawing showed vertical boarding and proposed horizontal boarding to blend better. L. Botticelli noted that a chimney and fireplace would be added to the back of the terrace. L. Botticelli asked what types of changes required further review by the Chestnut Hill Historic District Commission; J. Wyman stated that any significant changes should be submitted for review.

J. Wyman motioned to issue a Certificate of Non-Applicability for Phase I and Phase II of the application as submitted on the grounds that the project was exempt from mandatory review and requested that the applicants follow Commission members' recommendations regarding fencing, impervious surfaces and changes in the visibility and character of the property. W. Roesner seconded the motion. This motion was passed unanimously, 6-0.

**RECORD OF ACTION:**

**DATE:** June 19, 2014

**SUBJECT:** 109 Essex Road - Certificate of Appropriateness

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on June 19, 2014 the Chestnut Hill Historic District Commission, by vote of 6-0,

RESOLVED to issue a Certificate of Non-Applicability for Phase I and Phase II of the application as submitted at 109 Essex Road to remove existing wall and landscape existing semi-circular driveway; install landscape walls, paved area, terraces, paths and stairs; replace existing mudroom; and install garage bay with roof terrace, fireplace, and chimney. The Commission requested that the applicants follow Commission members' recommendations regarding fencing, impervious surfaces and changes in the visibility and character of the property.

**Voting in the Affirmative:**

**John Wyman, Chair**

**Joyce Dostale, Member**

**Robert Imperato, Member**

**William Roesner, Member**

**Samuel Perry, Alternate**

**Peter Vieira, Alternate**

J. Wyman noted for the record that Robert Imperato had left the meeting.

**32 Suffolk Road – Certificate of Appropriateness**

The application to pave the circular drive and install a water feature was withdrawn because the details of the size and location of the water feature were not available for the June 19<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**360 Hammond Street – Certificate of Appropriateness**

The owners, Nathan and Nina Eigerman, and the architect Timothy Burke, presented an application to install a porch and stairs. N. Eigerman explained that the owners wanted to remove the deteriorated entry

porches and install a single porch with Italianate details that connected the two doors and matched the height and depth of the existing porch.

Materials Reviewed:

*Assessor's Map*

*Photographs*

*Site plan*

*Elevations*

*Floor plans*

W. Roesner and P. Vieira proposed that a railing be added and Italianate bracketing be applied under the porch roof. P. Vieira stated that the mismatched second story window over the porch should be replaced with one that matched the other second floor windows; W. Roesner commented that matching the aluminum siding in that area could be difficult. J. Wyman asked what materials would be used. T. Burke stated that the following would be used: Spanish Cedar for the posts, pressure treated wood for the decking, and the low pitch rubber roof would have copper flashing. W. Roesner recommended caps on the joists to keep moisture out.

J. Wyman motioned to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as submitted with the following recommendations and requirements: 1) the possible addition of a railing; 2) the possible addition of Italianate brackets on the columns; 3) the added requirement to change the aluminum gutter reference to match existing copper; 4) the recommendation that the mismatched window on the second floor be replaced with a window that matches the other second floor windows; and 5) the added requirement to submit elevations of the details for staff review. S. Perry seconded the motion. This motion was passed unanimously, 5-0.

**RECORD OF ACTION:**

**DATE:** June 19, 2014

**SUBJECT:** 360 Hammond Street - Certificate of Appropriateness

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on June 19, 2014 the Chestnut Hill Historic District Commission, by vote of 5-0,

RESOLVED to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as submitted at 360 Hammond Street to install a porch and stairs with the following recommendations and requirements: 1) the possible addition of a railing; 2) the possible addition of Italianate brackets on the columns; 3) the added requirement to change the aluminum gutter reference to match existing copper; 4) the recommendation that the mismatched window on the second floor be replaced with a window that matches the other second floor windows; and 5) the added requirement to submit elevations of the details for staff review.

Voting in the Affirmative:

**John Wyman, Chair**

**Joyce Dostale, Member**

**William Roesner, Member**

**Samuel Perry, Alternate**

**Peter Vieira, Alternate**

**541 Hammond Street – Certificate of Appropriateness**

The architect Richard Streetman represented the owner and presented an application to install a side entrance vestibule and a screen for condenser units.

Materials Reviewed:

*Photographs*

*Site plan*

*Elevations*

B. Kurze requested that the General Permit application be submitted.

R. Streetman stated that four condenser units would be installed and hidden behind a fieldstone screen. Commission members proposed that the screen be designed as a landscape feature; W. Roesner noted that it could be integrated with the existing rear stone wall and possibly stepped, and S. Perry suggested that it drop off to the right. J. Wyman asked whether a line could be run away from the house; R. Streetman stated that this would be expensive. P. Vieira and J. Wyman noted that the two-foot clearance for service might be tight and cause issues with replacements. R. Streetman explained that the tallest condenser was 46 inches high and would be buried two feet, with a 30-inch wall, and would be open on top; J. Wyman commented that it should be covered.

J. Wyman motioned to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness with respect to the application to build a pad with a stone wall around it that was at least two different levels, that incorporated a step down with a return away from the house, that was in keeping with the rest of the landscape, and subject to the submission of a detailed proposal for and final approval of the stonework and other visible components. W. Roesner seconded the motion. This motion was passed unanimously, 5-0.

R. Streetman described the vestibule as projecting out with a glass door and sidelights, a bench and steps from the driveway. W. Roesner commented that the vestibule made the porch look cramped and the window placements did not work. J. Dostale proposed putting the vestibule on the inside. J. Wyman commented that the vestibule design did not work: the window was an issue and the divided porch was cramped and was not functional. R. Streetman said he would provide a new design review.

**RECORD OF ACTION:**

**DATE:** June 19, 2014

**SUBJECT:** 541 Hammond Street - Certificate of Appropriateness

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on June 19, 2014 the Chestnut Hill Historic District Commission, by vote of 5-0,

**RESOLVED** to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness with respect to the application to build a pad with a stone wall around it that is at least two different levels, that incorporates a step down with a return away from the house, that is in keeping with the rest of the landscape, and subject to the submission of a detailed proposal for and final approval of the stonework and other visible components.

**Voting in the Affirmative:**

**John Wyman, Chair**

**Joyce Dostale, Member**

**William Roesner, Member**

**Samuel Perry, Alternate**

**Peter Vieira, Alternate**

**Administrative Discussion:**

Commission members agreed to review the draft April minutes at the next meeting.

Commission members proposed a future discussion of whether some documents, such as the inventory forms, could be emailed or posted online.

Meeting was adjourned at 11:30 p.m.

Recorded by Barbara Kurze, Senior Preservation Planner.